	Case 1:24-cv-00257-KES-CDB Document 23	Filed 08/19/24 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JOSE ESTRADA,	Case No. 1:24-cv-00257-KES-CDB
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING WITHOUT
13	v.	PREJUDICE STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER
14	KAG WEST, LLC,	
15	Defendant.	(Doc. 22)
16		
17		
18	On August 16, 2024, the parties filed a proposed stipulated protective order. (Doc. 22). As	
19	discussed in more detail below, the undersigned is authorized to enter protective orders (Local Rule	
20	302(1)) provided they comply with Local Rule 141.1. The Court has reviewed the proposed	
21	stipulated protective order and concludes it does not comply with Local Rule 141.1. For the reasons	
22	set forth below, the Court DENIES without prejudice the parties' request to enter the proposed,	
23	stipulated protective order.	
24	The Stipulated Protective Order Fails to Comply with Local Rule 141.1(c)	
25	The proposed stipulated protective order does not comply with Local Rule 141.1. Pursuant	
26	to Rule 141.1(c), any proposed protective order submitted by the parties must contain the following	
27	provisions:	
28	//	

Case 1:24-cv-00257-KES-CDB Document 23 Filed 08/19/24 Page 2 of 2

1 (1) A description of the types of information eligible for protection under the 2 order, with the description provided in general terms sufficient to reveal the 3 nature of the information (e.g., customer list, formula for soda, diary of a 4 troubled child); 5 (2) A showing of particularized need for protection as to each category of information proposed to be covered by the order; and 6 7 (3) A showing as to why the need for protection should be addressed by a court 8 order, as opposed to a private agreement between or among the parties. 9 10 Local Rule 141.1(c). 11 Here, the protective order does not set forth a description of the types of information eligible 12 for protection under the order, nor any explanation as to what particularized need for protection is 13 required. Neither does the protective order set forth why the need for protection should be 14 addressed by a court order, as opposed to a private agreement between or among the parties. 15 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties' request for approval of the 16 proposed Stipulated Protective Order (Doc. 22) is DENIED without prejudice. The parties may re-17 file a revised, stipulated protective order that complies with Local Rule 141.1(c) and remedies the 18 deficiencies set forth in this order. 19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **August 19, 2024**

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE